DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 392 116 EA 027 336

AUTHOR Rusch, Edith A.; Marshall, Catherine
TITLE Gender Filters at Work in the Administrative Culture.
PUB DATE Apr 95
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; *Feminism; Higher Education; *Leadership Styles; Organizational Climate; *Power Structure; School Administration; *Sex Bias; Sex Discrimination; *Women Administrators

ABSTRACT

Research demonstrates that along with the usual filters for skills and competence, aspiring administrators also encounter the profession's gender filters. Gender filters appear as deeply shared understandings among female and male professional school administrators. Gender filters maintain the privilege of the dominant white male culture by silencing ideas and people that might disrupt the privilege of dominance. This paper analyzes research that examined factors in professional discourse and socialization that sustain gender filters, which exclude women and women's ways of leading from school administration. It summarizes the results of five studies conducted since 1985 and a content analysis of six professional journals. Feminist perspectives are used to explore strategies for developing and sustaining gender filters that confront privilege, that recognize the legitimacy of gender issues, and that support multiple perspectives within the culture of school administration. Findings indicate gender issues are marginal in the professoriate, in the curriculum, in classrooms, in educational administration texts, in theories of administration, and in professional literature. In summary, administrator education offers few opportunities to confront gender issues, practice complex gendered relations, or examine women's ways of leading. Women and minorities learn that their equity is not valued and that alternative ways of leading will be filtered out. A set of feminist filters that encourage the values of equity, diversity, and democratic practice for beginning administrators is offered: (1) construct a new set of assumptions; (2) male and female students should recognize their participation in the maintenance of privilege; and (3) universities must support a critical mass of feminist educators who model the new assumptive worlds. Two tables are included. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 392 116

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
E. Rusch
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Gender Filters at Work in the Administrative Culture

Edith A. Rusch
Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership
University of Toledo
Toledo, OH 43606

419-537-2095 (voice)
419-537-7719 (fax)
Internet: fac4177@uoft01.utoledo.edu

Catherine Marshall
Professor of Educational Leadership
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

919-966-1354 (voice)
919-962-1533 (fax)
Internet: marshall@email.unc.edu

Presented to Division A
at the
1995 Annual Meeting
of the
American Educational Research Association
San Francisco, CA

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA027336

Gender Filters at Work in Administrative Culture

Edith Rusch
The University of Toledo

Catherine Marshall
The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Introduction

Aspiring administrators work hard to gain understanding of the professional culture, the role responsibilities, and the mobility patterns that will insure success in a school leadership role. However, research demonstrates that along with the usual filters for skills and competence, aspirants also encounter the gender filters of the profession--the profession's way of managing gender equity issues (Greenfield, 1985; Hart, 1995; C. Marshall, 1985; J. D. Marshall, Otis-Wilborn, & Sears, 1991; Schmuck & Schubert, 1995). Based on the elusiveness of equity for women and women's ways of leading in educational administration, we argue that the existing professional culture in school administration teaches deeply embedded gender filters that govern talk, interpretations of meaning, actions, and espoused values about equity and diversity in ways that sustain patterns of gender inequity in the profession. Our argument is supported by statistics that verify the persistent dominance of white males in school leadership roles (Bell & Chase, 1993; Hansot & Tyack, 1981; Shakeshaft, 1989). The dominance holds even though abundant research suggests that women's leadership is more collegial, attuned to instruction and children, and less concerned with politics and bureaucracy and that women's interactions and decisionmaking are more inclusive and empowering (Andrews & Basom, 1990; Gilligan, 1982; Nodding, 1990; 1991). Despite the research, despite decades of affirmative laws and policies, men, or women who lead like men, invariably are selected for sponsorship or available administrative positions.

The reasons for this gender bias in administrative roles also continues to be verified by research. Explanations include male dominance in power positions (Shakeshaft, 1989); gender stratification in schools (Gaertner, 1981; Wheatley, 1981); sex discrimination (Bell, 1988; Bell & Chase, 1993); theory bias (Gosetti & Rusch, 1994; McCall & Lombardo, 1978; Shakeshaft, 1989; Yeakey, Johnson, & Adkinson, 1986); transition issues (Marshall, 1979); discriminatory access (Ortiz, 1982); and lack of sponsorship (Marshall, 1985). Once an aspirant attains position, socialization on the job only reinforces this inattention to equity (Schmuck, 1986). In fact, many administrators do not even see gender and gender equity as issues (Kempner, 1991). New administrators at all levels of the profession quickly learn what is legitimate talk, legitimate action, and legitimate values. Leaders who aspire to practice women's ways of leading are quickly socialized to the

norms of a one-sided professional culture (Marshall, 1992a) and, if the learning curve is rapid enough, career success is enhanced. New administrators who do choose different gender filters, filters that include persistent attention to issues of equity and diversity find their career to be far more complex, and perhaps, even short-lived (Ortiz, 1982; Tallerico, Burstyn, & Poole, 1993). We have an abundance of quality data that shows a self-perpetuating, continuous pattern of gender inequity persisting in an uninterrupted flow. This paper compiles research to reveal how gender inequity is sustained through socialization filters in administration. Questions guiding our investigation included:

> What factors in professional discourse and professional socialization establish and sustain the gender filters that exclude women and women's ways of leading from school administration?
>
> How do these gender filters support persistent dominance of white males and traditional malestream leadership ideology in school administration?

Bringing together multiple data sources and documented conclusions, we were able to address the larger question of the intractability of gender equity in school leadership. We conclude by offering feminist filters that would revise socialization and thus support a more democratic and equitable administrative culture

Research Process

This work brought together data gathered for 5 major studies completed since 1985[1] . The individual studies included questions about gender and equity and spoke to the constraints of the professional culture of school administration. Each study provided powerful insights about administrative culture, but their linked data provided a widened lens for focusinh on white professional socialization for administration.

First the linked data contributed to our definition of gender filters. We argue that gender filters currently operate as singular and restricted perspectives of school leadership drawn from a dominant culture that is theoretically, historically, and traditionally, white male. These filters appear as deeply shared understandings among female and male professional school administrators. Additional and more importantly, these deeply embedded gender filters function to maintain the privilege of the dominant white-male culture by silencing ideas and people that might disrupt the privilege of dominance.

---

[1] The original data souces include 20 case studies of assistant principals (Marshall, 1985; 1992a; Marshall & Mitchell, 1991), interviews with 26 "atypical" administrators (Marshall, 1992b), 3 case studies of women in administration (Rusch, Gosetti, & Mohoric, 1991); theory and professional discourse analysis (Gosetti & Rusch, 1994; 1995), and case studies of 6 "collaborative" administrators (Rusch, 1995).

To understand how these filters work to sustain the privilege of a singular perspective, we revisited work that explored the social construction of leadership (Rusch, Gosetti, & Mohoric, 1991). Three case studies were interrogated using a constant comparative process (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) for evidence of how women and men negotiate gender issues in administrative relationships (one of these cases is used in this paper to frame the discussion of gender filters). Categories identified from this process included 1) anger with challengers; 2) denial; 3) posturing and intellectualizing equity; 4) uncomfortable comfort; and 5) outsiders-within. Then using studies on the professional socialization of assistant principals (Marshall, 1985), values of "atypical" school assistant principals and principal leaders (Marshall, 1992b), the "assumptive worlds" of new administrators (Marshall & Mitchell, 1991) and leadership in democratic school communities (Rusch, 1995) data from interviews and case studies were reanalyzed for supporting or negating evidence of the five categories. Data from these studies not only supported the categories, but they provided additional meaning and ancillary actions that defined how administrators manage gender filters in their daily relationships. Our emerging research focus became, what are the messages in the formal in-university socialization and what are the messages in the informal, on-th-job socialization for administrators?

We reviewed literature on how the education and professional development of administrators reinforces the traditional and white male bias. The theory of territorial sexism (Herr Van Nostrand, 1993) was useful for framing research on professional discourse (Gosetti & Rusch, 1994; Rusch, Gosetti, & Mohoric, 1991), for examining data on the professorate and classroom practices, and for probing data on text and theory for evidence of gender filters (Gosetti & Rusch, 1994).

Next, following Gosetti and Rusch's (1994) assertion that practitioner journals reflect the professional discourse of educational administration, we looked at how professional reading supports or disrupts the gender filters that govern the values, styles, and behaviors of school leaders. We updated a content analysis of 6 professional journals read by practitioners and added a photo and graphics analysis of 4 of the journals[2]. Using equity analysis techniques introduced by Thiele (1987), McIntosh (1989), and Tetreault (1989), the articles and photos were coded by the degree to which the content challenged traditional viewpoints or supported traditional gender filters.

Then we reviewed data from Marshall's extensive work on assistant principals and "atypical" administrators. The emerging reanalysis yielded a widened picture of the

---

[2] Major articles from the past decade were identified using a key-word ERIC search of 10 gender-related terms; all reference list; editorials, commentaries, and essays were eliminated from the review.

interconnections among the formal structures in university discourse and socialization, the messages in professional discourse of journals, and the on-the-job socialization which coalesce to sustain gender filters in the professional culture. Finally, data from all studies were then reviewed for evidence of countervailing forces that would introduce and assert ways to reframe the professional discourse, patterns, practices, or structures to include equity concerns.

Results of Study

The reanalysis of the array of five studies show that, for the aspiring and practicing administrator, little disrupts an image of leadership dominated by traditional white-male perspectives. Our analysis supports the following conclusions:

- University preparation programs present a preference for white-male leaders. Accessible professional literature reinforces this white-male bias. The very limited professional conversation about equity, women, and women's ways of leading sustains and reinforces powerful and traditional gender filters. Visual images enhance the bias.

- In practice, professional socialization of administrators filters out those who are disruptive (because of questions they raise, the divergent values, styles, and behaviors of leadership, or because they are not white males). Professional socialization data demonstrated an overabundance of language and interactions reinforcing administrators' compliance with unstated taboos about equity.

From our analysis, it is also safe to assume the following:

- The schooling of administrators offers few opportunities to confront gender issues, practice complex gendered relations, or examine women's ways of leading.

- Women and minorities learn that their equity is not valued, that diverse/alternative ways of leading will be filtered out. Those who would interrupt the traditional white male dominance and introduce challenging alternative leadership behaviors are also filtered out or become marginalized.

- Practicing administrators find ways to manage their gender filters. We contend that these strategies provide evidence of how inequity is sustained within the profession.

- The identification of these behaviors provides insight for the development gender filters that lead to actualization of equity in school administration.

We report our analysis with an illustrative case of how gender filters influence administrative relationships. We then weave together research on formal education, professional discourse and professional socialization, identifying the forces that sustain gender filters. Next we describe the gender filters professors and practicing administrators

choose from to manage their gendered relationships. Finally, using feminist perspectives, we explore strategies for developing and sustaining gender filters that confront privilege, that recognize the legitimacy of gender issues, and that support multiple perspectives within the culture of school administration.

Gender Filters That Privilege

As administrators are socialized at work and in the university, they receive messages about the values, the knowledge base, the preferred behaviors, the skills and competencies required in the profession. In addition, the gender filters used by significant mentors, sponsors, superiors, professors, and other gatekeepers become powerful new lessons about gender equity for a new assistant principal. What do they learn?

Judi [a pseudonym] began her administrative career with an appointment as assistant to Douglas [a pseudonym], a long-term male principal who was determined to conclude his career with new and very divergent experiences. The new experiences included opening a new team-concept school, hiring his first female assistant, and trying a more participatory style of leadership. Douglas openly admitted discomfort with all three. As Judi and Douglas struggled with new behaviors-- she with a new job role, he with new job behaviors--their singular common ground was their journey as learners. Through frequent discussions, they began to talk about the complexity of gendered communication, about the divergence of their gendered leadership styles, and about their gendered perspectives for organizational changes. As time and conversations progressed, patience, humor, and practice increased their understandings of the built-in gender filters that inhibited their working relationship. They struggled with traditional gendered role expectations, male-leader behavior traits in women, the difference between respecting and giving equality, and Judi's inherent dislike of basketball and fishing. As you can see, their professional relationship was grounded in shared vulnerability. Then they went to a workshop on androgyny.

As the workshop speaker explained the power of androgyny for leaders, Judi realized that the presenter was describing her male colleague: sensitive, open, intuitive, supportive. But the presenter kept referring to these traits as feminine qualities. Douglas, sitting among his fellow principals and long-time friends, was surrounded by raised eyebrows, uncomfortable laughter and snide remarks. Soon he joined the laughter. Catching her eye across the room, Douglas raised his eyebrows and shrugged. At that moment, Judi knew that the concept of "androgyny" had become a new gender filter in their relationship. Despite the intellectual leaps toward equalizing their working

relationship, the privilege of Douglas' male colleagues to name androgyny as laughable was far more powerful than the gender equity they were exploring.

From that moment on Judi learned how powerful gender filters would be in framing her role as an administrator. She and Douglas never talked about the workshop on androgyny. Douglas never brought it up and Judi sensed an unwritten rule that the conversation was his choice alone. In fact, Douglas' behavior toward Judi became more directive and the personal conversations that included gendered reflections about their work ceased. For Douglas, modifying leadership and gendered behaviors seemed possible until someone created a label for the changes and his own peers openly derided the concepts. Who he was as a school administrator, and as a man, was so deeply embedded in a privileged culture that he could not risk being viewed as androgynous.

Judi's dilemmas were equally complex. Her enculturation as a woman, coupled with the gender filters in the privileged administrative culture, convinced her that she could not risk androgyny either. Like many new administrators, she intuited that exploration of gender issues and talk about gender in the workplace was risky. Like so many women and men, she quickly learned to hide and disguise her feminist beliefs in order to attain position and achieve status in the traditional school organization. She did attain status and position.

Going To School To Learn Gender Filters

How did Judi and Douglas learn that gender issues in leadership were unimportant and uncomfortable? What did they learn in their graduate education, certification programs, the literature, both theoretical and practical, and the professional associations that supported their behaviors as administrators? In this case, it is more important to think about the missing lessons than the visible lessons.

Missing lessons are a form of territorial sexism, one of the most powerful sustaining forces of gender privilege. Territorial sexism describes behaviors that control or relinquish territory that governs who can participate and to what degree they will have influence (Herr Von Nostrand, 1993). According to Herr Van Nostrand, "at its most extreme, territorial sexism allows no space at all for one gender--a form of bias by omission" (p. 38). In this section, territorial sexism is the framework for organizing research on the preparation and discourse for the profession of educational administration. We contend six powerful lessons become deeply embedded gender filters within the profession.

Lesson 1: Women are marginal in the professoriate.

From the moment the aspiring administrator enters the university program, the lesson is that the territory of the profession is predominately white male and, even more important, the program decisions in the profession are controlled by a predominately male perspective.

In the United States only 12 % of the professors of educational administration are women and there continues to be an almost 2:1 ratio of tenured, full professor males to tenured full professor females (McCarthy, Kuh, Newall, & Iacona, 1988). Women are seldom department chairs or deans, especially in educational administration where women are more likely to be in low numbers and in the lower ranks of the professoriate. Pounder (1989) concluded that gender discrimination is the only explanation for women professors earning $3000 less than comparable male professors. In a recent survey of professors of educational administration, Short and Walden (1989) found that almost half of the women were sole and token woman in their program; 81% of these women reported that during their graduate training they had just one or no female professors in their own graduate training. This is strange, since women earned 51% of the doctorates (a rise from 6% in 1971-72) and 59% of the Masters degrees in 1992 (Digest of Education Statistics, 1992). Similar statistics for degrees in education (not just educational administration) show 52% of doctorates and 57% of masters degrees going to women (Selected Higher Education Statistics, 1993).

Among professors of educational administration 84% of the men and only 37% of the women are tenured. Approximately two-thirds of the men and only about one-fifth of the women are full professors, but less than 9% of the men and 37% of the women are assistant professors (McCarthy, et. al, (1988). This model of employment, status, power, and reward in universities helps to shape gender filters.

Lesson 2: Gender Issues are Marginal in the Curriculum (or Territorial Sexism)

The perspectives that dominate the educational administration faculty also control the gender filters in the knowledge base studied by aspirants. The result is that the university education of principals is replete with territorial sexism. Standard coursework is modeled after business programs and few programs include any concentrated attention to gender issues or gendered perspectives. For example, to better understand Judi's gender filters, we reviewed the silences in her administrative preparation. After completing 72 credit hours or 2,160 clock hours of courses from four institutions related to leading and managing schools, her program included only one required class that included content related to gender issues. Shakeshaft (1989) reports that even though educational

administration programs now include more courses that specifically support women, the traditional coursework has not changed appreciably to include gendered perspectives or gender issues.

Researchers suggest that the omission of gender issues in administrative programs results from the replication of traditional business management programs they critique as developing administrators with myopic views of equity and justice in their schools, administrators with minimal understandings of democratic practices, and administrators who view equity issues as "no problem" (Anderson, 1990; Grundy, 1993; Kempner, 1991). New knowledge base designs offer little encouragement for altering the current professional culture. Reviews of documents prepared by The National Policy Board for Educational Administration (see Gosetti & Rusch, 1995) revealed glaring examples of territorial sexism and reinforcement of traditional privileged gender filters.

Lesson 3: Gendered Perspective are Marginal in Classrooms (or Peacocks and Midwives).

Our data also revealed that in educational administration classrooms, students encounter territorial sexism as 1) a contentious discussion about gender issues that results in anger and blame; 2) reports of changing policies related to gender that are legal (as opposed to moral) obligations; or 3) as total silences that communicate a lack of importance. We found limited classroom discourse that supported feminist views of schooling; in fact, some individuals reported being told by male professors that women's viewpoints or feminist perspectives would not be welcome in educational leadership classrooms.

The data also indicated few learning experiences focused on the work of scholars who advance equity issues, values in caring, community building, authenticity of emotions in organization, who support collaborative practices in administration. [3] For example, in reviewing Judi's administrative training, we documented course materials from four institutions that provided her administrative coursework and found six readings that related to equity or gender issues. Her comment: "I know just enough to be dangerous". Another women reviewing her leadership education noted the few courses that focused on women's perspectives:

---

[3] Scholars that research and advocate these issues come from a variety of theoretical positions other than feminism. However, the research work of feminists, centered around viewpoints of women and marginalized groups, has focused these concepts on teaching practices and administrative practices more than other theorists.

> To determine if any of the remaining courses offered included a woman centered perspective (or any other diverse perspectives), I reviewed the syllabi and reading lists. Not surprisingly, my review of the syllabi revealed no topics related to gender (or any other issues of diversity). More disturbing, however, was my discovery that out of approximately 200 readings, only 22 articles or books were written solely by a woman or by women and that only two of these articles were written by women, from the standpoint of women's experience. The silence is deafening. . . What am I, as a woman, being told about my past and future experiences as a leader? What embedded ideas about who can lead are being taught to future educational leaders? What are the underlying values in [university program] that determine how we prepare educational leaders to deal with issues of equality and equity? (Gosetti, 1992)

According to Herr Van Nostrand (1993), classrooms often represent a "peacock syndrome" (p. 139). She describes these classrooms as places where learning is dominated by loud, shallow, and insensitive voices--one who may be the professor. She also submits that the feminists values are learned more readily in classrooms where there is "real talk" (p. 146). She uses the metaphor of a midwife for this classroom, describing a learning environment that facilitates challenging, collaborative, dialogue where no voice is privileged.

Lesson 4: Gender is Marginal in Educational Administration Texts

The text that wrestles with the gender filters that govern talk and action between women and men in schools waits to be written. Standard introductory texts written to build understanding of the principalship or organizational theory are blatant in their territorial sexism. Those few texts that include content about women, equity, or diversity typically do so in a special chapter on women and minorities. The chapter, if included, is located at the end of the book, creating the image of gender and diversity issues as afterthoughts.[4] Usually, the remaining content of these introductory texts reflects a traditional gender privileged perspective of leading schools with no attention to feminist perspectives or women's experiences. Few texts about school administration are written by women (for examples see Capper 1993; Marshall, 1992a; Ortiz, 1982) or focus on women in administration (for examples see Blackmore & Kenway, 1993; Dunlap & Schmuck, 1995; Marshall & Kasten, 1994; Restine, 1993; Shakeshaft, 1989). Women and men committed to feminist perspectives come away from these early learning experiences knowing that their viewpoints, values, and behaviors are not a part of the scholarship that defines school leadership.

---

[4] For examples see Kaiser, 1994; Kowalski & Reitzug, 1992; Lunenberg & Ornstein, 1991

Lesson 5: Gender is Marginal in Theories of Administration

Another way teritorrial sexism guides the development of gender filters for administrators is found in the explication of leadership and organizational theory. Well known and often used leadership theory texts are "full of sexist language and patriarchal ideology (Smythe, 1989, p. 22) and "come from an embedded privileged perspective which largely ignores issues of status, gender, and race and insidiously perpetuates a view of leadership that discourages diversity and equity (Gosetti & Rusch, 1995, p. 12).

A key example is found in the most prominent leadership theory guiding research and practice for scholars and school administrators today: transformational leadership. Transformational leadership in educational administration is framed by the work of James MacGregor Burns (1978), who, despite his verbal support for gender equity, based his theory almost solely on the study of male leaders. Burns also placed strong emphasis on hierarchical and patriarchal order for transformational leadership to take place. [5] In a critique of Burn's work, Argyris ((1993) points out that the notion of the transformational leader is very abstract and "omits important behavioral puzzles and dilemmas" (p. 26). More current versions of transformational leadership (Leithwood, 1992; Rost, 1992; & Sergiovanni, 1990) omit the same behavior puzzles and dilemmas. None of the authors examine the gender filters in Burns' original theory nor do they reframe the definition of transformational leading with a study that identifies gendered perspectives. The unexamined assumptions of leadership theory as gender neutral works to sustains a professional culture that avoids the puzzles and dilemmas of gendered leader behavior.

Territorial sexism also appears in organizational theory. One vivid example is found in a text by Lee Bolman and Terence Deal who use reframing and gendered examples as a premise that "multiple lenses" (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. xv) will help leaders see and understand more about their choices and decisions. However examples for the four frames that guide choices come primarily from white-male, corporate, or sports worlds, frequently are stereotypes of gendered behaviors or are presented in ways that cement traditional and privileged gender filters. [6]

---

[5] For an extended critique of Burns' work see Rusch, Gosetti, and Moboric, 1991.

[6] For more detailed examples of the privileged gender filters found in this text, see Gosetti and Rusch, 1995.

Lesson 6: Gender is Marginal in Professional Literature

Professional literature reinforces the importance or unimportance of gender issues in the administrative culture. The data (see Table 1) show how rarely traditional gender filters are challenged in professional reading.

Table 1

Educational Journals 1983-1994	Articles published during decade	Articles focused on gender, equity, and/or diversity	Content challenges territorial sexism
Educational Leadership	1740	60	16
Executive Educator	825	31	8
NASSP Journal	944	46	8
Phi Delta Kappan	1600	82	31
Principal	522	18	1
School Administrator	527	41	5

The low number of articles brought forward by the search clearly supports our position of a limited conversation about gender and equity among practicing professionals but the limited number that challenge territorial sexism or disrupt traditional gender filters is astounding. Higher numbers are also deceptive; journals that appear to pay more attention to the issues frequently do so by publishing special subject editions. For instance, The Kappan, published the majority of 70 articles in special issues devoted to gender or equity, remaining largely silent on the subject for extended periods of time during the decade. Subtitles and photographs also contribute to mixed messages for the professional. For example, one article reporting research on gender differences in the principalship noted that women principals were viewed as more nurturing, more caring, and as stronger instructional leaders than male colleagues. Even though the research represented K-12 principals, the subtitle of the article was "A Woman's Place is in the Elementary Principalship" (Andrews & Basom, 1990, p. 38-40). Within one brief subtitle, nurturing, caring, and supporting was defined and confined to elementary settings and women were relegated to one type of position in the administrative structure. This, again is a potent example of the territorial sexism that blinds school leaders to the real issues of gender equity.

Visual images also fortify gender filters and territorial sexism. Our review of the photographs and graphic that accompany articles on leadership in Educational Leadership, Phi Delta Kappa's Kappan, Principal, and School Administrator provides additional support to the notion that gender filters are reinforced in very subtle ways (Table 2 & 3). For example, in our 10 year review we found that photographs accompanying articles

about the principalship, powerful leadership, or unusual leadership opportunities were typically of men. Photographs that use mixed groups of people never showed women taller than men, not do they show men looking up to women. Articles about shared decision-making, collaboration, participatory management, or job sharing most often include a photo or sketch of women. In one case, two special issues dedicated to examining women in leadership contained sketches that portrayed women as confused, in conflict, and facing midlife issues of depression, anger, and entrapment. The lack of attention to professional discourse and lack of balanced gender images in journals are additional examples of Herr Van Nostrand's (1993) territorial sexism: actions that control or influence the values that have potency, who can participate, and to what degree they will have influence.

Table 2

Educational Journals 1983-1994	Traditional view of women and men in leader roles	Challenge to traditional view.	Neutral view
Educational Leadership	65	21	14
Phi Delta Kappan	18	11	
Principal	17	4	
School Administrator	53	13	

Table 3 Examples of Images (Totals from all Journals)

Traditional	Challenge	Neutral
(15) Men standing over seated women or taller than women	(2) Women taller or equal in height (1) Young black male supervising older white man	(3) Women supervising women
(67) Male images of leaders	(10) Leaders as all female (5) Equal groups of men & women (12) Effective leaders: photo of equal sized group of men and women or women alone.	(3) Elementary female leaders
(24) Women's images as collaborative, site-based leaders, or coaching.	(12) Mixed group of women and men featured as collaborative	
(4) Women's leader images portrayed negatively		

Based on this review of "going to school" we argue that if we are to uphold democratic values related to equity, diversity and community building, theories and scholarship that advance these issues must be validated and legitimized as central to being a quality administrator. We also assert that if nothing in the professional literature disrupts and reframes a new way of thinking about gender issues, administrators' ability to "see"

equity remains myopic. When knowledge about the complexities of gendered social relations is missing or scant, administrators remain handicapped and reluctant to communicate effectively through the minefield of gendered social relations. Furthermore, we argue that this lack of knowledge influences how the gatekeepers to sponsorship of new administrators in schools see and behave related to issues of gender equity. Next we show how gender filters affect practicing administrators as they enter the profession and move along a career path.

Going To Work To Learn The Gender Filters

Research on the Assistant Principalship

More often than not, the assistant principalship is the position where new administrators learn how to fit in and succeed in the professional culture of school administration. Women and men encounter a great deal of ambiguity and stress as novices as they search for the signals, markers, and guidelines that help them feel a part of the professional culture. In research on assistant principals, Marshall (1992) found that on-the-job training taught them that 1) they must find ways to manage "professional shock" right away; 2) they must learn the "assumptive worlds" of administration; and 3) their career orientation and chances for attaining higher positions depended upon how well they managed professional shock and learned the assumptive worlds. The following sections highlight the portions of Marshall's research that explain how gender filters influence new administrators and accordingly, become deeply embedded assumptions about equity that influence career paths for themselves and others.

Professional Shock

Leaving the professional culture of teachers to enter a new professional culture entails searching for role models and sponsors. As new assistant principals try to impress colleagues and gain inclusion in the new culture, they are shocked to find, often in their first months on the job, that administrators sometimes do things that are sexist, stupid, inefficient, bad for children, patronizing and harmful to teachers. They find political

infighting, bureaucratic rules, and inappropriate policies that prevent them from doing what they need to do for children and teachers. One described the professional shock:

> Breaking up fights is no problem. Discipline problems do not bother me. Helping teachers can be frustrating but not stressful; classroom coverage, not having enough books isn't stressful. Stress comes from seeing underhanded things done on the job--manipulation, violation of confidence. It's not stress in the job itself. (in Marshall, 1985, p. 39).

Others described seeing their principals cutting back programs just to get rid of one teacher or showing favoritism. New assistant principals discovered that they must learn to display a calm demeanor, to cover up that shock, and to hide the stress. Doing otherwise made them look like outsiders who might be filtered out of the profession.

Assumptive Worlds

As they learn to cope with and manage professional shock, assistant principals continue on-the-job adjustments to their professional culture. They learn the assumptive worlds of administrators--the unstated but shared rules about values and behaviors allowed and/or forbidden (see Marshall, 1992, and Marshall and Mitchell, 1991 for a more detailed description of assumptive worlds). Some learn from mimicking role models but many learn by their mistakes: reprimanding words and cold stares from their superiors tell them they have violated one of these rules. Assumptive world rules that frequently modify the gendered behaviors and equity values of a new assistant are illustrated in the following examples taken from research conducted by watching and interviewing administrators on the job.

Rule 1. Limit your risk-taking: do not take initiative except where superiors will not be threatened and you require few resources with high likelihood of success. In Marshall's (1992) case studies, administrators' initiatives were for student discipline, attendance, and school newspapers--all site level initiatives that challenged the prerogative of no one.

Rule 2. Re-make policy quietly: when district, state, or federal policies get in their way, administrators act as "street-level bureaucrats" --re-making policy by micro-alterations (Weatherly and Lipskey, 1977). Administrators learn to just do this without calling attention to the deficiencies in the policy. When district policies for managing substitute teachers, for informing parents, for getting more office supplies were cumbersome, administrators created their own systems. Having to cope with the "street level" realities (e.g. chronically scarce resources), administrators quietly violate federal laws for services for disabled students or state laws setting building safety standards.

Rule 3. Avoid moral dilemmas: administrators face dilemmas where, in order to help a child they must hurt a teacher or, in order to protect a teacher they must fire another teacher or a popular custodian or, they must challenge their principal. They learn to find ways to avoid the confrontation, and thus the dilemma, by getting the student or teacher transferred.

Rule 4. Do not display divergent values: when the district or the principal is persistently and adamantly pushing for a new program to raise quality of teaching or curriculum, administrators learn to hide their concerns for areas where equity values will be jeopardized. One assistant kept lamenting how "power and money don't give a damn" about inner-city and minority children, saying "we have a Superintendent who keeps cheering us on, but in an environment where none cares but us. . ." (in Marshall and Mitchell, 1991, p. 405). This open display of his values put the assistant at odds with teachers, his principal, and the district power structure.

Rule 5. Demonstrate unflagging loyalty and commitment: when the superintendent likes people to belong to the same social and professional clubs, administrators must join. When the principal wants administrators to be fascinated with hobbies or the latest exciting trend in staff development, administrators must get excited too.

Rule 6. Avoid the "troublemaker" label: administrators must not take a visible and outspoken stand in district conflicts. One who did, as spokesman for the administrators association in a dispute with the teachers union, was told that he had jeopardized his chances for promotion. Another assistant, who was tempted to challenge the fairness of the district's principalship exam (which she had failed), decided to keep quiet because she had learned the assumptive world rules.

Rule 7. Keep disputes private: disputes and problems at the school site must be managed at the sites, behind the scenes as much as possible. Administrators learn to get along without resources and without needed policy alterations rather than bump the problem up to central office or to the Board. One assistant, in charge of facility repair and maintenance, got a firm reprimand when she pressed central office too hard to correct her school facility.

Rule 8. Cover all your bases: no matter how impossible the job description, administrators must give at least token attention to every aspect of their jobs. An African American assistant discovered this rule when she decided to spend a great deal of time counseling and working with some angry African American students, thinking she would prevent racial conflicts by giving them a place to talk and be counseled. In doing so, she failed to complete her regularly assigned duties on time. She was seen as an ineffective administrator.

Rule 9. Build administrator team trust: administrators who have relationships of open communication, loyalty, trust, and respect with their fellow site administrators will fare well. However the relationship must be based on the traditional privileged professional culture. When administrators cannot build that relationship, they will not become insiders in administration.

Rule 10. Align your turf: administrators must identify and take charge of the more valued, critical tasks and areas of responsibility and fend off incursions from central office supervisors, teachers, or other administrators. Although administrators' specific understandings may vary from school to school--sometimes the prized tasks

are instructional supervision, sometimes discipline, sometimes extra-curricular activities--the assistant must hold onto that turf.

To be allowed insider status in school administration, new administrators must learn the assumptive world and act in compliance with the overarching set of understandings. Their values, their activities, and their initiatives must be constrained. Clearly, the assumptive world inhibits those who would challenge the status quo, who would challenge dominant power interests, who would raise serious questions about dilemmas, inequities, and inefficiencies. With these understandings, how does a new administrator decide whether or not to take initiative for equity, to raise concerns about gender issues, to press for change? How do these assumptive worlds redefine and shape the gender filters used by a new administrator?

Career Orientation in the Assistant Principalship

Administrators develop their orientation to the career from their experiences during their first administrative positions. Those who fit well into the culture and have good assignments pass through the filters and, often, move into higher positions. Those who have few supports and make the "wrong" choices in dealing with professional shock and learning the assumptive worlds have very different orientations and future career development. In a reanalysis of the extensive case studies on administrators reported in Marshall, Mitchell, Gross, and Scott (1994) and Marshall, (1992a) the researchers identified six orientations to the career, governed by gender filters that shape administrator goals. The orientations are:

1. Upwardly Mobile: these administrators will move, perhaps as high as a superintendency, since the risks they take are successful and get them visibility. They have sponsorship, and they understand the assumptive worlds;

2. Plateaued: these people sought higher positions but were turned down; they are seen as lacking in human relations or some other nebulous skill. They also lack a mentor or sponsor.

3. Shafted [outcasts]: these administrators were once seen as upwardly mobile but conditions changed. Perhaps the politics of the district changed or their sponsor left. They are angry and feel cast aside.

4. Career: these people are settled and comfortable, feeling and being seen as effective administrators for the rest of their career.

5. Downwardly mobile: administrators who were once principals or central office administrators and administrators who consider returning to teaching, sometimes by choice, e.g. for health reasons and some times because of staff cutbacks or as involuntary demotion.

6. Considering leaving: administrators who consider careers outside of education, realizing they have skills and connections that could give them a more rewarding job.

Complex and interacting variables affect the experiences that shape career orientations but the overarching variable is their ability to fit into the professional culture during their first administrative position. Chances at mentoring and sponsorship, the opportunity to work where one could agree with the dominant values, where one could display commitment, loyalty and administrator team trust, where there is enough to trust and commit to are critical shapers of administrators' career orientations. Needless to say, their ability to manage professional shock and work within the assumptive worlds highly influence a new administrator's career orientation.

This leads us to the question of gender as a variable affecting the shaping of experiences among new administrators. How do these realities affect the woman administrator, the feminist administrator, the administrator whose vision and mission is to raise a challenge anytime school practices produce inequities?. The next section discusses how gender matters, given what we know from the research on assistant principals and atypical school leaders.

Choices, Crossing Boundaries, and Managing Gender Filters

We return briefly to the story of Judi and Douglas (see page 5). Judi's experience reflects the extraordinary obstacles and pain assistant principals face when they attempt to establish gender equity and integrate feminist values into their new role. It also portrays the complex issues men and women face as they attempt to understand and bridge gendered experiences. However, our analysis of research on university professional discourse and early socialization gives no hope that new educational administrators will have support in managing the tensions. Instead they will encounter professors, sponsors, mentors, gatekeepers, and school administrators who exhibit the following array of gender filters:

1) Anger with Challengers: As new assistant principals challenge traditional and privileged policies and practices, the Anger Filter manifests itself in cold stares, impatience, and labels of deficiency and has the effect of silencing or undermining open dialogue about gender equity and diversity.

2) Denial: Administrators using the Denial Filter wear gender blinders, espousing that the professional culture is gender-neutral. Any references to gender equity or gendered perspectives are treated as irrelevant and time-wasting. At best, the discussion is reserved for "fringe groups" who have "personal problems."

3) Posturing and Intellectualizing Equity: This school administrator openly speaks about women becoming assistant principals, espouses great pride about the number

of women hired and mentored, and frequently pontificates about the importance of gender equity in education. Administrators who use the Posturing and Intellectualizing Filter seldom have actions that match the words, but they garner attention from colleagues and feminist educators by vocalizing a divergent value position.

4) Uncomfortable Comfort: This school administrator is adept at all sides. He or she recruits and mentors women and feminist educators to the assistant principalship. Like the principal described in the story, the Uncomfortable Comfort Filter supports engaging in dialogue about equity issues. However, when faced with critical and personal equity questions, these administrators remains silent and usually retreat from the previously espoused support positions.

5) Outsiders-Within: Operating within an established personal/professional system of values and behaviors, this administrator chooses to be a loner, an atypical, or as described by Collins (1991), an "outsider within". This educator successfully moves up and within the hierarchy but never becomes one of the inner circle. Frequently marginalized by peers, the Outsider Within Filter supports rejection of full insider status. In other words, this administrator does not internalize the dominant world view nor does she/he further the privileged perspective by behaving in privileged ways. This administrator may have the respect of peers, but are rarely regarded as colleagues. For an outsider within, colleagueship with privileged peers has limited value. For a assistant, affiliation with an "outsider within" may be a professional risk.

Finding and sustaining leaders who support equity and diversity remains as our biggest challenge. These leaders are often Outsiders- Within, working in risky controversial ways, eschewing career mobility concerns, and defying their professional culture. Also, they are working without backing from the legitimized texts and formal education in educational administration. New administrators who begin their career working with an outsider principal will develop very different assumptions about team trust, risk taking, equity values, and diversity, but at the same time, they will be challenged to sustain those assumptions in a professional world that does not legitimize them. At the present time, the role model for the different kind of administrator is not always the woman or man who is most admired in the school system; instead she or he may be the atypical, the challenging outsider who pursue equity goals by redefining the assumptive worlds.

We know that most administrators in positions of power to mentor and select new school leaders were educated at a time when gender equity was not even in the vocabulary of school organizations. We also know that, even though practicing administrators' awareness, understanding, and commitments to equity are influenced by law and policy, the messages communicated and modeled in professional education, professional development, and professional discourse still sustain a culture that effectively filters out women leaders and women's ways of leading. We argue that until educational leaders, both scholars and practitioners, understand how gender filters work to cloud their ability to

"see" equity, and modify the gender filters they use to develop and sustain equity, white-male dominance in school leadership will persist. The final section of this paper examines how feminist filters can support increased equity in the professional culture of school administration.

Feminist Filters that Revise the Story

Women and men in all areas of education cannot continue to ignore the silences and privileges that our current gender filters impose on school leaders. We conclude this paper by proposing feminist filters that help us to confront and acknowledge privilege, filters that support and bring to the center the outsider within, filters that change the discourse in text, in socialization, and in the professional world in ways that give moral legitimacy to feminist perspectives and women as leaders. We propose a set a feminist filters that not only allow, but encourage and celebrate values of equity, diversity, and democratic practice for beginning administrators.

Feminist theory and research calls the question of white male dominance and commands attention to women's' experience, needs, rights, and values. [7] For education, feminist perspectives introduce the caring ethic (Beck, 1994; Noddings, 1992); moral decision making that emphasizes relationships, connections, collaboration, and community (Gilligan, 1982); women's ways of talking, leading, and nurturing (Belenky, 1986 ; Cooper, 1995; Dunlap & Schmuck, 1995; Regan, 1990, 1995; and feminist pedagogy (Grumet 1988; Greene, 1988; Weis, 1988; Weis & Fine, 1993). Importantly, "power and politics" feminisms focus on the ways institutional politics maintain a gendered hierarchy in schools, creating separate male and female domains that sustain the power of men and the oppression of women (Blackmore & Kenway, 1993; Marshall & Anderson, in press; Tong, 1989). Beyond claiming entry to men's worlds, "hurling a 'me too' at the wall of arrogance and exclusion" (Ferguson, 1993, p. 2), power and politics feminisms challenge traditional and male oriented research and theory and work to "put women at the center" (Ferguson, 1993, p. 3).

The feminist reframing brings into focus the power of gender filters on the processes for assessing, training, selecting, and promoting people into the profession. The feminist frame also shows how we select the few who fit the dominant culture and filter out those whose values, attributes, and experiences do not fit or those who challenge cause discomfort or disruption. The big question is how could feminist filters rewrite the

---

[7] The expanding feminist literature includes a range of "schools" with different emphases, valuable for dialogue and debate on gender filters. (see Tong, 1989, Grant, 1993, Weiner, 1994, hooks, 1984)

androgyny story? What would Douglas and Judi need within their professional culture to continue their exploration of new gendered relationships?

- •What formal and informal learning experiences in the profession would help them both accomplish their learning journey to equity?
- •How do we develop a critical mass of caring educators at all levels of the profession who can support feminist viewpoints?
- •How do we foster educational settings where complex and personally painful dialogues can take place among men and women that deal with intimacy, sexuality, integrating personal and professional lives, gendered communication, and gendered leadership choices?
- •How do we foster learning among men and women?
- •How do we get to the point at all levels of this educational profession where we stop pointing fingers, and begin to look inside? bell hooks calls it finding the oppressor within . Finding the oppressor within means that women must confront their collusion in maintaining gender filters and men must go beyond acknowledging the privilege.

Constructing New Assumptive Worlds For Administrators

To conclude, we suggest some beginning steps to foster the development of feminist filters for new administrators that eliminate the professional shock and sustain administrators' pursuit of equity and democratic praxis in school. We mean to imply different job descriptions, different organizational models, different professional training and development, and different reward and mobility systems for educational administration.

For example, for entry level administrators to learn that ideal model of leadership that incorporates equity and feminism, the assumptive world lessons would have to be different. Instead of those that constrain the development of administrators, new assumptive worlds would be as follows:

1. Become risk takers
2. Remake policy democratically
3. Engage in moral dilemmas
4. Dialogue openly about values
5. Redefine loyalty and commitment based respect for diversity
6. Have equal voice: lines of communication become circles
7. Share role responsibilities in practical ways--client -centered decision making
8. Build team trust around shared values

9. See schooling holistically: real leadership has no turf

Such assumptive world understandings, instead of supporting and promoting the risk-aversive, dilemma avoider who covers up predicaments in policy and practice, would, instead, require administrators to actively critique and challenge inefficiencies, inequities, and insensitivities that impede educators striving to make schools caring communities for nurturing children's development.[8]

A first step could be to include in assistant principal's job description a structure for addressing dilemmas, diversity, and democracy--a kind of "daily dilemmas dialogue". Instead of managing or suppressing dilemmas, particularly dilemmas related to gender, diversity, and equity, administrators would lead forums within their school community that would legitimize these issues as normal and essential to democratic schooling. With this as a task, a site administrator's socialization, and thus, their assumptive worlds, would be quite different. Openness and inclusiveness in communication would be valued leadership capacities-- capacities which are most evident in women's communication and leadership styles (Belenky, 1988; Herr Van Nostrand, 1993; Tannen, 1990, 1994a, 1994b). Role models, certification standards, professional journals, and even theory and text would have to change.

Feminist Filters for Formal Education

For the androgyny story to continue as a persisting dialogue between Judi and Douglas, their graduate education, their formal administrator certification, and other rites of passage would need new feminist filters. Graduate schools would, in their employment models, their structures, their curricula, and their knowledge base, have to recognize,

---

8 In recent studies (Marshall 1992b & Rusch, 1994; 1995) with administrators who challenge traditional practice and sustain feminist filters for leading within a white male dominated professions, we found individuals who are risk-takers (e. g. implement new programs before they are popular), who exhibit vulnerability and openness within their school communities, and who forego the need for the security and power of their positions or the rewards of upward mobility.

Our data portray these individuals as successful "outsiders within", someone who "goes to the beat of her own drummer", someone "who is removed from the everyday drivel of what we do". Personally these school leaders talk and are described as very centered individuals who are clearly congruent in their value for and practice of equity. One principal openly defied district policy for schooling homeless children, arguing that "one good day at our school may make an enormous difference for this child; I'm not about to waste time finding out where the family car is parked!" Others talk about "hustling for your kids no matter what you are faced with" or taking "seriously the notion of oppression".

Yet, these Outsiders-Within are very forthright about their lack of colleagues within the profession; they talk about being "at a very different place than the rest of the principals in the organization", of "feeling isolated among my fellow principals", of "my notion of what a school should be doesn't seem to jive with what my superiors' notion of what a school should be". Professional friends of these individuals of suggest that fear drives the marginalization, fear that the equity standards maintained by these individuals will become standard expectations for peers as well.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

acknowledged process, and altered privilege. Both in the professoriate and in the formal curriculum, educators--men and women alike--would need experiences that compel them to recognize their participation in the maintenance of privilege. For men, more often this would entail recognizing that their attainments were not necessarily earned and that the malestream theories that ensconce their privilege also keep them from self-reflection, intimacy, connection, and sensitivities that are prerequisites for building relationships, collaboration, and for confronting moral dilemmas. For women, more often this would entail recognizing that silences about inequity support men's privilege and keep women in outdated sex-role stereotyped patterns--an inadvertent collusion with their oppressors.

If Douglas and Judi are to find support for continuing their conversation, a first step would be a structure for personal/professional change--what hooks (1989) describes as locating the oppressor within (p. 21). For example, an "institute for retraining the professoriate" could focus on gender filters and incorporate a reframing of educational administration--theory and practice--to include feminist filters. Emerging trends that support the development of feminist filters can be found in classrooms that require fledgling administrators to develop a "platform"--a values stance. There also is evidence of increased use of case books on ethical, personal, equity, and career dilemmas in the core curriculum in universities (see for example Marshall & Kasten, 1994 and Starrett, 1993). Additionally, supportive trends and materials are available for rewriting the texts, with scholars writing a herstory of educational leadership (Marshall & Bell, in progress), sharing ways of reframing values (Marshall, Rogers, & Steele, in press; Noddings, 1992), presenting ways of incorporating feminist and cultural studies (Blackmore & Kenway, 1993; Marshall & Anderson, in press; Dunlap & Schmuck, 1995), and espousing ways to define the administrator as "critical humanist" (Foster, 1986). Each of these trends increase the possibility of changing the gender filters that currently challenge new assistant principals.

This paper, by identifying gender filters and territorial sexism as a way to frame research on educational administration's socialization and discourses, provides a clear picture of the challenge . Persisting in the practice of entitling men to power and decision privileges will not transform education. To change the gender filters, universities and schools must support a critical mass of feminist educators, well-paid, and with loud voices, as often as not as the leaders, who model the new assumptive worlds: risking, challenging, pursuing equity, engaging in dialogue over complex and painful dilemmas in schooling and in the profession. These behaviors will transform leadership and increase democratic praxis in schools.

References

Anderson, G. L. (1990). Toward a critical constructivist approach to school administration: Invisibility, legitimation, and the study of non-events. Educational Administration Quarterly, 6(1), 38-59.

Andrews, R., & Basom, M. (1990). Instructional leadership: Are women principals better? Principal, 70(2), 38-40.

Argyris, C. (1993). Knowledge for action. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barrett, R. (1992). Voices from the inside: A report on schooling from inside the classroom No. The Institute for Education In Transformation at The Claremont Graduate School.

Beck, L. (1994). Reclaiming educational administration as a caring profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, J. (1986). Women's ways of knowing. New York: Basic Books.

Bell, C. (1988). Organizational influences on women's experience in the superintendency. Peabody Journal of Education, 65(4), 31-59.

Bell, C. & Chase, S. (1993). The underrepresentation of women in school leadership. In C. Marshall (Eds.), The New Politics of Race and Gender (pp. 141-154). Washington D.C.: Falmer.

Blackmore, J., & Kenway, J. (Ed.). (1993). Gender matters in educational administration and policy. London: Falmer Press.

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1991). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Burns, J. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Capper, C. (Ed.). (1993). Educational administration in a pluralistic society. Albany, NY: SUNY.

Collins, P. H. (1991). Learning from the outsider within. In M. M. Fonow & J. Cook (Eds.), Beyond methodology (pp. 35-39). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Cooper, J. (1995). Administrative women and their writing: Reproduction and resistance in bureaucracies. In D. Dunlap & P. Schmuck (Eds.), Women Leading in Education New York: SUNY.

Dunlap, D., & Schmuck, P. (Ed.). (1995). Women leading in education. New York: SUNY.

Ferguson, K. (1993). The man question: Visions of subjectivity in feminist theory. Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press.

Foster, W. (1986). Paradigms and Promises. Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books.

Gaertner, K. N. (1981). Administrative careers in public school organizations. In P. Schmuck,W. W. Charters, & R. O. Carlson (Eds.), Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials (pp. 199-217). New York: Academic Press.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967) The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.

Gosetti, P. (1992). The privileges of leadership. Unpublished paper. The University of Oregon.

Gosetti, P., & Rusch, E. (1995). Re-examining educational leadership: Challenging assumptions. In D. Dunlap & P. Schmuck (Eds.), Women Leading in Education New York: SUNY.

Gosetti, P. & Rusch, E. A. (1994). Diversity and equity in educational leadership: Missing in theory & in action. Presented to Division A at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association. New Orleans.

Greene, M. (1988). The dialectic of freedom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Greenfield, W. D.(1985). The moral socialization of school administrators: Informal role learning outcomes. Educational Administration Quarterly, 21(4), 99-119.
Grumet, M. (1988). Bitter milk. Amhurst, MA: The University of Massechusetts Press.
Grundy, S. (1993). Educational leadership as emancipatory practice. In J. Blackmore & J. Kenway (Eds.), Gender matters in educational administration and policy (pp. 165-180). London: Falmer.
Hansot, E. & Tyack, D. (1981). The dream deferred: A golden age for women school administrators (Policy Paper No. 81-C2). Stanford University.
Hart, A. W. (1995). Women ascending to leadership: The organizational socialization of principals. In D. Dunlap & P. Schmuck (Eds.), Women Leading in Education New York: SUNY.
Herr Van Nostrand, C. (1993). Gender responsible leadership. Newbury Park: Sage.
Kaiser, J. (Ed.). (1994). The 21st century principal. Mequon, WI: Stylex.
Kempner, K. (1991). Getting into the castle of educational administration. Peabody Journal of Education, 104-123.
Kowalski, T., & Reitzug, U. (1993). Contemporary school administration. New York: Longman.
Leithwood, Kenneth.(1992). Developing expert leadership for future schools. London: Falmer.
Loden, M., Rosener, J. (1991). Workforce America! Managing employee diversity as a vital resource. Homewood, IL: Business One IRWIN.
Lunenburg, F., & Ornstein, A. (1991). Educational administration: Concepts and practices. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
Marshall, C., & Anderson, G. (in press). Rethinking the private and public spheres: Feminist and cultural studies perspective on the politics of education. In J. Scribner & D. Layton (Eds.), The Study of Educational Politics London: Falmer.
Marshall, C., Rogers, D. & Steele, J. (in press). Caring a Career: An alternative perspective for educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly.
Marshall, C., & Bell, C. (in progress). Constructing a herstory of educational leadership. Unpublished grant proposal to Spencer Foundation.
Marshall, C., & Kasten, K. (1994). The administrative career: A casebook of entry, equity, and endurance. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
Marshall, C. (1992a). The assistant principal. Newbury Park: Corwin.
Marshall, C. (1992b). School administrators' values: A focus on atypicals. Educational Administration Quarterly. 28(3), 368-386.
Marshall, C., & Mitchell, B. (1991). The assumptive worlds of fledgling administrators. Education and Urban Society, 23(4), 396-415.
Marshall, C. (1985). Professional shock: The enculturation of the assistant principal. Education and Urban Society, 18(1), 28-58.
Marshall, C. (1979) Career socialization of women in school administration. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Santa Barbara.
Marshall, J. D., Otis-Wilborn, A., & Sears, J. T. (1989, published in 1991). Leadership and pedagogy: Rethinking leadership in professional schools of education. Peabody Journal of Education66(3), 78-103.
McCall, M. & Lombardo, M. (Ed.). (1978). Leadership: Where else can we go? Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
McCarthy, M., Kuh, G., Newell, D., & Iacona, C. (1988) Under Scrutiny: The Educational Administration Professoriate. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.
McIntosh, P. M. (1989). Curricular re-vision: The new knowledge for a new age. In C. S. Pearson, D. L. Shavlik, & J. G. Touchton (Eds.), Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in higher education (pp. 400-412). New York: American Council on Education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Noddings, N. (1990). Feminist critiques in the professions. In C. B. Cazden (Eds.), Review of research in education (pp. 393-424). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.
Noddings, N. (1991). The gender issue. Educational Leadership. 49(49), 65-70.
Noddings, N. (1992). The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education. New York: Teachers College Press.
Ortiz, F. I. (1982). Career patterns in education: Women, men, and minorities in school administration. New York: Praeger.
Pounder, D. (1989). The gender gap in salaries of educational administration faculties. Educational Administration Quarterly, 24(2), 181-201.
Regan, H. (1995). In the image of the double helix: A reconstruction of schooling. In D. Dunlap & P. Schmuck (Eds.), Women Leading in Education New York: SUNY.
Regan, H. (1990). Not for women only: School Administration as a feminist activity. Teachers College Record, 91(4), 565-577.
Restine, N. (1993). Women in administration: Facilitators for change. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
Rost, J. (1991). Leadership for the 21st Century. New York: Praeger.
Rusch, E. (1995). Leadership in evolving democratic school communities:. Paper to be presented to Division A of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA.
Rusch, E. (1994). Gaining voice: Democratic praxis in restructured schools. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA.
Rusch, E. A.,Gosetti, P., & Mohoric, M. (1991). The social construction of leadership: Theory to praxis. 17th annual conference on Research on Women in Education, sponsored by the American Educational Research Association.. San Jose, CA.
Schmuck, P. & Schubert, J. (1995). Women principals' view on sex equity: Exploring issues of information, identity, and integration. In D. Dunlap & P. Schmuck (Eds.), Women Leading in Education New York: SUNY.
Schmuck, P. (1986). Gender and education: culture, character, and concepts. Invited lecture.. University of South Florida.
Sergiovanni, T.,Burlingame, M.,Coombs, F., & Thurston, P. (1992). Educational governance and administration. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Sergiovanni, T. (1990). Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
Shakeshaft, C. (1989). Women in educational administration. Newbury Park: Corwin.
Short, P. & Walden, (1989)
Smythe, J. (Ed.). (1989). Critical perspectives on educational leadership. Philadelphia: Falmer.
Snyder, T. & Hoffman, C. (1992). Digest of Education Statistics. Washington, D. C.: The National Center for Educational Statistics
Starrett, R. J. (1991). Building an ethical school: A theory for practice. Educational Administration Quarterly, 27(2), 185-202.
Tallerico, M. Burstyn, J. & Poole, W. (1993). Gender and politics at work: Why women exit the superintendency. Monograph published by The National Policy Board for Educational Administration. Fairfax, VA.
Tannen, D. (1990). You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation. New York: Wm. Morrow.
Tannen, D. (1994a). Gender and discourse. New York: Wm. Morrow.
Tannen, D. (1994b). Talking from 9-5: How women's and men's conversational styles affect who gets heard, who gets credit, and what gets done at work. New York: Wm. Morrow.
Tetreault, M. K. (1986). The journey from male-defined to gender-balanced education. , 25(4), 227-234.

Thiele, B. (1987). Vanishing acts in social and political thought: Tricks of the trade. In C. Pateman & E. Gross (Eds.), Feminist challenges: Social and political theory (pp. 30-43). Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Tong, R. (1989). Feminist thought: A comprehensive introduction. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Weatherley, R., & Lipsky, M. (1977). Street-level bureaucrats and institutional innovation: Implementing special education. Harvard Educational Review, 47(2), 171-197.

Weiner, G. (1994). Feminisms in education: An introduction. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Weis, L. (Ed.). (1988). Class, race, and gender in education. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Weis, L., & Fine, M. (Ed.). (1993). Beyond silenced voices: Class, race, and gender in United States schools. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wheatley, M. (1981). The effects of organizational structures on sex equity in education. In P. Schmuck, W. W. Charters, & R. Carlson (Eds.), Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials (pp. 255-271). New York: Academic Press.

Yeakey, C. C., Johnston, G. S., & Adkison, J. (1986). In pursuit of equity: A review of research on minorities and women in educational administration. , 22(3), 110-149.